

REMARKS

Claims 13-25, 35-45 and 47 are now pending in the application. Claims 12 and 46 have been cancelled by this amendments. Claim 14 has been made independent by this Amendment. Minor amendments have been made to the specification and claims to simply overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The amendments to the claims contained herein are intended to broaden the scope thereof and/or are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. The Office Action indicates that the structure of Claim 46 is not shown in the drawings. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 46 has been cancelled, therefore this objection is rendered moot.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 46 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim has been cancelled, therefore this rejection has been rendered moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlisle in view of Amann. Claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shekelton et al. in view of Amann. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 12 has been cancelled, therefore the rejection thereto has been rendered moot.

Claims 13, 15-17, and 22-25 have been amended to depend directly or indirectly from amended Claim 47. Claim 47 has been indicated as objected to because it depended from a rejected base claim, but would be in condition for allowance if amended into independent format to include the limitations of any base claims. Claim 47 has been so amended and should be in condition for allowance. Thus, Claims 13, 15-17, and 22-25 should also be in condition for allowance.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claim 14 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly,

Applicants have amended Claim 14 to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, Claim 14 should now be in condition for allowance.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for the indication of Claims 18-21 and 35-45.

Claim 47 has been indicated as objected to because it depended from a rejected base claim, but would be in condition for allowance if amended into independent format to include the limitations of any base claims. Claim 47 has been so amended and should be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6-16-06

By: 

Michael L. Taylor, Reg. No. 50,521

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/MLT